

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/661,549 | NAGATA, TAKAYUKI | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Michael C. Zarroli | 2839 | |

All Participants:
Status of Application: allowed

 (1) Michael C. Zarroli (USPTO).

(3) _____.

 (2) Felix D'Ambrosio (aty).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 23 January 2006
Time: 1pm
Type of Interview:

- ☐ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
 102

Claims discussed:
 1 and 15

Prior art documents discussed:
 Chang

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
 See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner sent an e-mail suggesting an examiner amendment. Applicant never responded. After more closely looking at the reference Chang, examiner decided the case could be allowed. See reasons for allowance for why Chang was determined not to read on the independent claims..